

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL HIGHWAYS AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING HELD IN
CLAYTON, MISSOURI, ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2002**

A special meeting of the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission held on Thursday, October 3, 2002, was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by the Chairman, Mr. Ollie W. Gates. The following members were present: Mr. W. L. (Barry) Orscheln, Vice Chairman, Ms. Marjorie B. Schramm, Mr. Bill McKenna, Mr. James B. Anderson, and Mr. Duane S. Michie.

The meeting had been called pursuant to Section 226.120 of the 2000 revised Statutes of Missouri as amended. The Secretary verified that notice of the meeting was posted in keeping with Section 610.020 of the 2000 revised Statutes of Missouri, as amended.

* * * * *

* * * * *

Mr. Henry Hungerbeeler, Director of the Missouri Department of Transportation; Mr. Rich Tiemeyer, Chief Counsel for the Commission; and Mrs. Mari Ann Winters, Secretary to the Commission, were present on Thursday, October 3, 2002.

* * * * *

“Department” or “MoDOT” herein refers to the Missouri Department of Transportation.

“Commission” or “MHTC” herein refers to Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission.

FRAMEWORK FOR TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND DECISION MAKING

On behalf of the Director, Kevin Keith, Chief Engineer, reminded the Commission of his presentation on September 6, 2002, pertaining to (1) the planning process used for making transportation decisions and (2) the funding distribution process. Following that presentation, the Commission directed the staff to consider its input in further developing the transportation planning and decision-making process. Mr. Keith stated that as a result of the directive, the staff had developed a third option. Option 3, he explained, differed from Option 1, which was presented on September 6, 2002, only in the area of distribution of funds for taking care of the existing system. Option 1 considered vehicles miles of travel, lane miles, and square feet of bridges in its determination of funding allocation for taking care of the existing system; Option 3 is based on condition of the existing facility.

Mr. Keith reminded the Commission that the funding allocation for taking care of the existing system pertains only to the 9000-mile National Highway System and major arterials and bridges. He emphasized that the needs-based approach suggested in Option 3 applies only to taking care of the existing system. Under his Option 3 proposal, 50 percent of the funds remaining after taking care of the existing system would be allocated to major projects with project selection being on a statewide basis, and 50 percent would be allocated to regional and emerging needs based on population and employment.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Keith explained that following the Commission’s April 5, 2002, meeting, the staff had organized a group to work on the priority

process/funding allocation issue, which included representatives from Missouri Association of Council of Governments (MACOG), as well as individuals from other regional planning commissions and metropolitan planning organizations. He noted that a consensus among that group on a preferred option could not be reached. He clarified that the options presented to the staff have been shared with regional planning commissions and metropolitan planning organizations, but not the MACOG group as a whole.

In response to Commissioner Anderson, Mr. Keith said the urgency for a Commission decision on this issue is to allow time for the staff to develop a Five-Year Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). He noted that legislation states that MoDOT will include its five-year plan in its annual report to the Joint Committee on Transportation Oversight, which is due prior to November 10, 2002. The desired priority selection/funding allocation method will allow the staff to select specific projects to include in year five (2007) of the program. Mr. Keith noted that the staff had delayed preparation of the STIP until the results of the voter decision on Proposition B were known. That delay, coupled with the required 45-day public comment period, will cause the five-year plan to be included in the annual report as a draft document.

Resulting discussion revealed the following:

- Commission members are receiving communications from various interests indicating that transportation stakeholders, government entities, and others were unfamiliar with, misunderstood, or did not agree with the staff recommendations on this issue.
- While roadway systems are identified and given priority as to intensity of importance, volume of traffic is not a consideration in system condition as it relates to determining the condition of the roadways and bridges.
- Option 3 would allow existing roads and bridges to be brought up to a consistent level on a statewide basis.
- Identifying specific funding for improvement to the interstate system is desirable.
- Uncompleted Proposition A projects remain a Commission commitment.

- Unfunded projects from the Fiscal Year 2003 tentative bond list remain a Commission commitment.
- The Commission desires a balance between taking care of the existing system and finishing what has been started, so that one category does not exclude the positive merits of the other.
- Only 35 percent of the National Highway System and arterial system pavement condition is currently in good condition; the options proposed by the staff attempt to achieve 85 percent good condition on the Interstate System, 50 percent good condition on the NHS and arterials, and status quo on the collector system over the next ten year period.
- The staff proposals anticipate that selection of statewide major projects will focus on finishing what has been started.
- Attempts had been made in the past for various committees to address the priority selection/funding allocation issue; however, no consensus has been forthcoming.

Commissioner Orscheln summarized the changes in funding allocation from 1992 to date and Commissioner McKenna summarized issues pertaining to the 1992 Fifteen Year Plan.

Mr. Keith recommended that sufficient resources be allocated to taking care of the existing system first with progress being made on the Fiscal Year 2003 tentative bond financing projects and/or Proposition A projects as funds allow.

Following the discussion, Chairman Gates stated that a decision on the issue would be deferred to allow scheduled public input on the issue at the October 4, 2002 meeting.

* * * * *

* * * * *

By unanimous vote of all members present, the meeting of the Commission was adjourned.

* * * * *